

NOTE ON THE CANDIDATE COUNTER-EXAMPLE IN THE CANCELLATION PROBLEM FOR AFFINE SPACES

SUSUMU ODA

ABSTRACT. The Cancellation Problem is the following : Let k be a field of characteristic zero and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. If $R[Y] \cong_k k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ as a k -algebra, where $Y, X_1, \dots, X_n$ are indeterminates, then $R \cong_k k[X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]$. In this paper, it is shown that the candidate (or possible) counterexample of the above problem in $n = 5$ conjectured by van den Essen, Arno and P. van Rossum [3] is not the Case if we can settle the hypothesis F_4 (see the body below), which is a special case of the well-known Conjecture. In this paper, the conjecture is not established unfortunately. So the Cancellation Problem can not be declared to be still open for $n \geq 4$ or not.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Cancellation Problem for Affine Spaces (or the Zariski Problem) is the following:

The Cancellation Problem for Affine Spaces(the Zariski Problem). *Let k be a field of characteristic zero and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $(n \geq 2)$. If $R[Y] \cong_k k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ as a k -algebra, where $Y, X_1, \dots, X_n$ are indeterminates, is $R \cong_k k[X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]$?*

We may assume that $k = \mathbb{C}$ in the above problem. The answers are affirmative for $n = 2$ ([5]) and $n = 3$ ([8]).

Throughout this paper, all fields, rings and algebras are assumed to be commutative with unity.

Our general reference for unexplained technical terms is [13].

Notation :

$\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of the natural numbers,

$\mathbb{R}$ denotes the real number field,

$\mathbb{C}$ denotes the complex number field,

$\mathbb{C}^{[n]}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) denotes a polynomial ring of n -indeterminates over $\mathbb{C}$,

$R^{[n]}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) denotes a polynomial ring in n -variables over a ring R ,

R_f denotes the localization of a ring R by the powers of $f \in R$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification : 13B25

Key words and phrases: The cancellation Problem, polynomial rings and affine domains

Let $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field k of characteristic zero. Then ∂_{X_i} denotes the partial derivative by X_i in $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$.

Let R be an k -algebra. Then a k -linear map satisfying $D(ab) = aD(b) + bD(a)$ for $a, b \in R$ is called a k -derivation on R . Furthermore $R^D := \{a \in R \mid D(a) = 0\}$, which is a k -subalgebra of R . If for every $a \in R$, $D^r(a) = \underbrace{DD \cdots D}_r(a) = 0$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, then D is called a *locally nilpotent derivation* on R . If $s \in R$ satisfies $D(s) = 1$, then we say that D has a *slice* s . Note that D^r is not necessarily a derivation.

Preparation 1.1. ([5, p.1314] or [6, Proposition 1.3.21 and Corollary 1.3.23]) *Let D be a locally nilpotent derivation having a slice s in A , where A is a $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra. Then A is a polynomial ring in s over A^D , i.e., $A = A^D[s]$ and $D = \frac{d}{ds}$ on A having a slice s in A .*

Corollary 1.2. ([6, Corollary 1.3.23]) *Let A an R -algebra (and R is $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra). Let $D \in \text{Der}_R(A)$ be a locally nilpotent derivation on A . Let $\varphi(a) = \sum \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} D^i(a) s^i$ for any $a \in R$. Then $A^D = \varphi(A)$. In particular if G is a generating set for the R -algebra A , then $\varphi(G)$ is a generating set for the R -algebra A^D .*

A. Shastri [12] obtained the following polynomial representation of the trefoil knot by putting $f(u) := u^3 - 3u$, $g(u) := u^4 - 4u^2$, and $h(u) := u^5 - 10u$ and $\alpha(u) := (f(u), g(u), h(u))$, where $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$. It is easy to see that $F(f(u), g(u), h(u)) = u$, with $F(X, Y, Z) := YZ - X^3 - 5XY + 2Z - 7X$. This map α is an embedding and is called *Shastri's embedding*, which extends to $\alpha : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

Arno van den Essen [5, Conjecture 5.1] was inspired by Shastri's embedding, and posed the following conjecture. If this conjecture is affirmative, then "The Cancellation Problem for Affine Spaces (the Zariski Problem)" has a negative solution in the case $n = 5$.

Conjecture E *Let $A := \mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]$ denote a polynomial ring, and let $f(u), g(u)$ and $h(u)$ be the polynomials defined above. Let $D := f'(u)\partial_x + g'(u)\partial_y + h'(u)\partial_z + t\partial_u$ (which is easily seen to be a locally nilpotent derivation on A). Then $A^D \not\cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[4]}$.*

Since D has a slice $s := t^{-1}(u - F(f(u) - tx, g(u) - ty, h(u) - tz))$, and $A^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}} A/(s)$, this conjecture is equivalent to the following conjecture by Lemma 1.1.

Conjecture E' $\mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]/(s) \not\cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[4]}$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} s &= t^{-1}(u - F(f(u) - tx, g(u) - ty, h(u) - tz)) \\ &= -7x - 7u^2x + 13u^4x - 3u^6x - 9tux^2 + 3tu^3x^2 - t^2x^3 \\ &\quad + 5uy - 5u^3y + u^5y + 5txy + 2z - 4u^2z + u^4z - tyz, \end{aligned}$$

Conjecture E' is not so easily verified by computations.

There has been another non-settled conjecture which is a special case of Dalgachy-Weisfeiler Conjecture (see also [10], [11]). :

Conjecture F_n .(cf. [16]) *Let R be a $\mathbb{C}$ -affine domain, let T be an element in $R \setminus \mathbb{C}$ and let $i : \mathbb{C}[T] \hookrightarrow R$ be the inclusion. Assume that $R/TR \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[n-1]}$ and that $R_T \cong_{\mathbb{C}[T]} \mathbb{C}[T]_T^{[n-1]}$. Then $R \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^n$.*

Proposition 1.3. *Let R be a $\mathbb{C}$ -affine domain, let T be an element in $R \setminus \mathbb{C}$ and let $i : \mathbb{C}[T] \hookrightarrow R$ be the inclusion. If $R_T \cong_{\mathbb{C}[T]} \mathbb{C}[T]_T^{[n-1]}$, then $R/(T - \alpha)R \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[n-1]}$ canonically for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^\times$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $R/(T - \alpha)R = R_{(T - \alpha)}/(T - \alpha)R_{(T - \alpha)} \cong_{\mathbb{C}} (\mathbb{C}[T]_{(T - \alpha)})/(T - \alpha)\mathbb{C}[T]_{(T - \alpha)}^{[n-1]} \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[n-1]}$ because $T \notin (T - \alpha)$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. $\square$

Remark 1.4. We use the same notations as in Proposition 1.3. It is easy to see that R is a UFD by Nagata's Theorem [7, Theorem 7.1] because T is a prime element in R and $R_T \cong_{\mathbb{C}[T]} \mathbb{C}[T]_T^{[n-1]}$, a UFD. Since $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^{n-1} \cong_{\mathbb{C}} {}^a i^{-1}(V(T - \alpha)) = \text{Spec}(R/(T - \alpha)R)$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $T - \alpha \in \mathbb{C}[T]$ is a non-zero-divisor on both $\mathbb{C}[T]$ and R , and $R/(T - \alpha)R$ is regular. Hence R is faithfully flat and smooth over $\mathbb{C}[T]$ by [2, Corollaries 6.9 and 6.3] and [9, pp.269-270].

For $n \leq 3$, this conjecture has been established [16], which depends probably the fact that the automorphism group of a polynomial ring in 2-variables is generated by tame automorphisms. Note that the automorphism group of a polynomial ring in n -variables ($n \geq 3$) requires some wild (not tame) generators (see M. Nagata's example).

Let's call this conjecture of the case $n = 4$ "Hypothesis F_4 " in the sequel.

Hypothesis F_4 *Let R be a $\mathbb{C}$ -affine domain, let T be an element in $R \setminus \mathbb{C}$ and let $i : \mathbb{C}[T] \hookrightarrow R$ be the inclusion. Assume that $R/TR \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[3]}$ and that $R_T \cong_{\mathbb{C}[T]} \mathbb{C}[T]_T^{[3]}$. Then $R \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[4]}$.*

The author strongly think that Hypothesis F_4 seems to be affirmative.

Our objective of this paper is to show that **under Hypothesis F_4** , these Conjectures E and E' have negative answers. That is, we show the following:

The Main Result. *Let $A := \mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]$ denote a polynomial ring, and let $f(u) := u^3 - 3u$, $g(u) := u^4 - 4u^2$, and $h(u) := u^5 - 10u$. Let $D := f'(u)\partial_x + g'(u)\partial_y + h'(u)\partial_z + t\partial_u$ be a derivation on A (which is easily seen to be a locally nilpotent derivation on A). Suppose that **Hypothesis F_4** holds. Then $A^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[4]}$.*

The proof of The Main Result is shown in the next section.

Remark 1.5. A certain mathematician informed the author the following **familiar $\mathbb{C}$ -variety** :

Take the first projection $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ and the projection $pr_x : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ where X denotes the KR threefold $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]/(-x^2z + y^2 + x + t^3))$. He says both are **smooth** equidimensional over $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$, and both restrict to the trivial $\mathbb{A}^2$ -bundle over the complement of the origin in $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$.

However [9, p.269] asserts the KR threefold X above is nonsingular but $pr_x : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ is not smooth.

Indeed, the fiber $pr_x^{-1}(0)$ at $0 \in \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1 = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[x])$ is isomorphic to $\text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[z, y, t]/(y^2 + t^3))$, which is not a regular ring. This contradicts the fact in [9, p.269] if $pr_x : X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ is smooth. His example is not effective in our argument.

2. THE MAIN RESULT

In this section, we show that Conjecture E above is negative **under Hypothesis F_4** .

From now on, we use the following notations.

Let $A := \mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]$ denote a polynomial ring, and let $f(u) := u^3 - 3u$, $g(u) := u^4 - 4u^2$, and $h(u) := u^5 - 10u$. Let $D := f'(u)\partial_x + g'(u)\partial_y + h'(u)\partial_z + t\partial_u$ be a derivation on A (which is easily seen to be a locally nilpotent derivation on A). Let $A^D := \{\alpha \in A \mid D(\alpha) = 0\}$.

Put $F(X, Y, Z) := YZ - X^3 - 5XY + 2Z - 7X \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y, Z]$. Then $F(f(u), g(u), h(u)) = u$ by an easy computation.

Let $v_{[x]} := f(u) - xt$, $v_{[y]} := g(u) - yt$, $v_{[z]} := h(u) - zt \in A$ and $s = s(t, u, x, y, z) := t^{-1}(u - F(v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}))$. Then $s(t, u, x, y, z) \in A$ and $D(s) = 1$ by the easy computation, and hence $A = A^D[s]$ is a polynomial ring by Lemma 1.1.

Preparation 2.1. *The elements $t, v_{[x]} := f(u) - xt, v_{[y]} := g(u) - yt, v_{[z]} := h(u) - zt$ belong to A^D and*

$$A_t = \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}][s]_t = \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, u]_t[s] = A_t^D[s].$$

Proof. Indeed, $D(t) = f'(u)\partial_x(t) + g'(u)\partial_y(t) + h'(u)\partial_z(t) + t\partial_u(t) = 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 0$ and $D(v_{[x]}) = f'(u)\partial_x(v_{[x]}) + g'(u)\partial_y(v_{[x]}) + h'(u)\partial_z(v_{[x]}) + t\partial_u(v_{[x]}) = -f'(u)t + 0 + 0 + tf'(u) = 0$. By the same way, we have $D(v_{[y]}) = 0, D(v_{[z]}) = 0$. Thus $\mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z] = A = A^D[s] \supseteq \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}][s] = \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}][t^{-1}(u - F(v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}))]$. Localizing by powers of t , we have $A_t = A_t^D[s] \supseteq \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}, s]_t$. In A_t ,

$$s = t^{-1}(u - F(v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]})) \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}, s]_t$$

implies that

$$u - F(v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}) \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}, s]_t$$

and hence that

$$u \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}, s]_t \quad (*).$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}, s]_t = \mathbb{C}[t, u, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}, s]_t.$$

Since

$$v_{[x]} = f(u) - tx \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s] = \mathbb{C}[t, u, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s],$$

we have

$$tx \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s]$$

and hence

$$x \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s].$$

Similarly, we obtain that $y, z \in \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s]$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s] = \mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]_t[s].$$

Namely, by (*) we have

$$A_t = A_t^D[s] = \mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t[s].$$

□

Corollary 2.2.

$$A_t^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}[t]} \mathbb{C}[t]_t^{[3]}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Preparation 2.1 because $\mathbb{C}[t, v_{[x]}, v_{[y]}, v_{[z]}]_t \cong_{\mathbb{C}[t]} \mathbb{C}[t]_t^{[3]}$. □

From Corollary 1.2, we have the following Preparation.

Preparation 2.3. Let $\varphi(\)$ denote the same as in Corollary 1.2 (here $R = \mathbb{C}$). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t) &= t, \\ \varphi(u) &= u + ts, \\ \varphi(x) &= x + 3(1 - u^2)s + 3tus^2 - t^2s^3, \\ \varphi(y) &= y + 4(2 - u^2)us + 3ts^2 - t^2s^3, \\ \varphi(z) &= z + 5(2 - u^4)s + 10tu^3s^2 - 10t^2u^2s^3 + 10t^3us^4 - t^4s^5. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Therefore } A^D = \mathbb{C}[\varphi(t), \varphi(u), \varphi(x), \varphi(y), \varphi(z)].$$

Preparation 2.4. $A^D/tA^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[3]}$.

Proof. First we claim $tA \cap A^D = tA^D$. Indeed, take $t\eta \in tA \cap A^D$ ($\eta \in A$). Then $0 = D(t\eta) = D(t)\eta + tD(\eta) = tD(\eta)$ because $t \in A^D$. Since A is an integral domain, we have $D(\eta) = 0$, that is, $\eta \in A^D$.

Since $A^D[s] = \mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]$ and $\varphi(u) = u + ts$, we see that $u = \varphi(u) - ts \in A^D + tA$ and that $\bar{u} \in (A^D + tA)/tA = A^D/tA \cap A^D = A^D/tA^D$ according to the first paragraph. Put $R = A^D/tA^D$. It is clear that $R[\bar{s}] = \mathbb{C}[\bar{u}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}]$ is a polynomial ring. Since $R \ni \overline{\varphi(x)} = \bar{x} + 3(1 - \bar{u}^2)\bar{s}$, we have $R_{1-\bar{u}^2}[\bar{x}] = R_{1-\bar{u}^2}[\bar{s}] = \mathbb{C}[\bar{u}]_{1-\bar{u}^2}[\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}] = \mathbb{C}[\bar{u}]_{1-\bar{u}^2}[\bar{y}, \bar{z}][\bar{x}]$ and hence $R_{1-\bar{u}^2} = \mathbb{C}[\bar{u}]_{1-\bar{u}^2}[\bar{y}, \bar{z}]$. It follows that $R \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\bar{u}]} \mathbb{C}(\bar{u}) = \mathbb{C}(\bar{u})^{[2]}$. Since $(R/(\bar{u} - \beta)R)[\bar{s}] \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}]$ for every $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ (which is a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{C}$). Hence $R/(\bar{u} - \beta)R$ is $\mathbb{C}$ -isomorphic to a polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}^{[2]}$ by [8]. It follows that $A^D/tA^D = R$ is $\mathbb{C}$ -isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^{[3]}$ by [11, §3], [10]. □

Now we obtain the main result:

The Main Result. *Let $A := \mathbb{C}[t, u, x, y, z]$ denote a polynomial ring, and let $f(u) := u^3 - 3u$, $g(u) := u^4 - 4u^2$, and $h(u) := u^5 - 10u$. Let $D := f'(u)\partial_x + g'(u)\partial_y + h'(u)\partial_z + t\partial_u$ be a derivation on A (which is easily seen to be a locally nilpotent derivation on A). Suppose that **Hypothesis F_4** holds. Then $A^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[4]}$.*

Proof. From Preparation 2.4 and Corollary 2.2, we have a $\mathbb{C}$ -isomorphism:

$$A^D/tA^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}^{[3]} \quad \text{and} \quad A_t^D \cong_{\mathbb{C}[t]} \mathbb{C}[t]_t^{[3]}$$

for each $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$. So A^D is $\mathbb{C}$ -isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^{[4]}$ by Hypothesis F_4 . $\square$

Some Conjectures are seen in [5]. Concerning Main Result, we assert the following Remark.

Remark 2.5. If Conjecture E is affirmative, it gives a negative answer to the Cancellation Problem and to the Linearization Problem and shows that Shastri's embedding is indeed a counterexample to the Embedding Problem and the $\mathbb{A}^n$ -Fibration Problem ($n \geq 3$) over a line $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$. However, by The Main Result, if Hypothesis F_4 is affirmative, then they are also still open by [5, p.132].

Added in Proof. The author would like to express his thanks to Professor Michiel de Bondt, who informed the candidate counterexample [5] to the author. The author wonders why Conjecture E has been left unsettled for more than ten years.

REFERENCES

- [1] A.Altman and S.Kleiman, Introduction to Grothendieck duality theory, Lecture Notes in Math. 146, Springer-Verlag (1970).
- [2] D.Eisenbud, Commutative Algebra with a view toward algebraic geometry, GTM 150, Springer-Verlag (1995).
- [3] H.Bass, E.H.Connel and D.L.Wright, Locally polynomial algebras are symmetric algebras, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 82 (1976), 719-720.
- [4] D.Eisenbud and J.Harris, The Geometry of Schemes, GTM 197, Springer-Verlag (2000).
- [5] A.van den Essen and P.van Rossum, Triangular derivations related to problems on affine n -space, Proc. Amer. Math. Sc. 130 (2002), 1311-1322.
- [6] A. van den Essen, Polynomial Automorphisms and the Jacobian Conjecture, volume 190 of Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser-Verlag (2000).
- [7] R.Fossum, The Divisor Class Group of a Krull Domain, Springer-Verlag (1973).
- [8] T.Fujita, On Zariski Problem, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci 55 (1975), 106-110.
- [9] R.Hartshorne, Algebraic Geometry, GTM 52, Springer-Verlag (1977).
- [10] T.Kambayashi, On one-parameter family of affine planes, Invent. Math. no. 52 (1979), 275-281.
- [11] T.Kambayashi and D.Wright, Flat families of affine lines are affine-line bundles, Illinois Journal of Math. Vol. 29 (1985), 672-681.
- [12] E.Kunz, Introduction to Commutative Algebra and Algebraic Geometry, Birkhäuser (1985).
- [13] H.Matsumura, Commutative Algebra, Benjamin, New York (1970).
- [14] H.Matsumura, Commutative Ring Theory, Cambridge Univ. Press (1980).

- [15] A.Shastri, Polynomial representations of knots, Tohoku Math. J. (1992), 11-17.
- [16] A.Sathaye, Polynomial rings in two variables over a D.V.R.: A Criterion, Invent. Math., 74 (1983) 159-168,

Department of Mathematics
 Faculty of Education
 Kochi University
 2-5-1 Akebono-cho, Kochi 780-8520
 JAPAN
 ssmoda@kochi-u.ac.jp